



Privileged and Confidential

PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL EVALUATION REPORT

Date of Evaluation: 01/11/2024**Student Name:** [REDACTED]**NYC ID:** 222729022**DOB:** [REDACTED] Redacted for PII**Grade:** 9th Grade**School:** 000AJS;Judge Rotenberg Educ Center**Evaluation Type:** Reevaluation**Language of Assessment:** English**Reason for Referral and Relevant Background:**

[REDACTED] was referred for a re-evaluation. He was last evaluated from October 2018 to May 2019. Cognitive testing revealed average memory, reasoning and verbal skills but low average processing speed and working memory skills. Academic testing noted average reading comprehension skills but below average ability in all other academic areas. At that time, diagnoses from Dr. Jordan Zelinger and Dr. David Salsberg included PTSA, ADHD and Learning Disability. An addendum completed in 2020 noted average scores in many areas related to reading and word recognition skills approaching the average range. Weaknesses were noted in math and written expression on the KTEA-3.

According to his last report card, [REDACTED] is achieving grades within the 80s and 90s in all subject areas. His effort rating was considered excellent in most subjects. Teacher comments were positive. Based on a teacher report, [REDACTED] has built strong, respectful relationships with staff and peers. In ELA, [REDACTED] has worked to improve his grammar and providing details in his work. With teacher support, he has been able to write coherent pieces. In math, concerns were expressed with comprehension of math word problems and poor math fluency. He is able to advocate for his needs. He complied with residence rules and was noted to maintain a low frequency in behavior.

Based on his current IEP, [REDACTED] is classified as a student with an emotional disability. He attends a special class (10:1:1) with 1:1 behavioral supports. [REDACTED] receives counseling 3 times a week. [REDACTED] was noted to be emotionally regulated at his residential program, where he can follow daily routines and expectations. He is more motivated and engaged in learning. During times of dysregulation, all areas of his life are impacted. Reading is noted to be his strongest subject while he struggles with basic math skills.

PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL EVALUATION RESULTS

Assessment Methods:

- Vocational Assessment - Student Interview
- Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC-3)
- Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children (WISC-V); Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (KTEA-3)

Student Interview and Assessment Session Behaviour Observations:**Validity of Assessment Results**

Due to [REDACTED] current placement, the psycho-educational assessment was completed remotely. As such, standardized tests were administered using standard assessment procedures when possible, but in an alternate format (e.g., the student had to verbalize answers instead of pointing to them) when needed. Efforts were made to adhere to standard procedures to the greatest extent possible. Results should be considered in light of these unique

circumstances.

Behavioral Observations

█████ logged in with school staff at the agreed upon time. It should be noted that a staff member was present in the room throughout the duration of testing. He presented with a calm and neutral affect. █████ presented as a polite boy who easily followed directions. He would ask for clarification occasionally to ensure he performed tasks correctly. █████ was noted to raise his hand to ask a question or request a chance to drink his water. He did not become outwardly frustrated with the increasing task difficulty but was noted to give up easily on some items. █████ response rate varied. While he took his time to think about answers and rarely admitted that he did not know an answer on many tasks, █████ was noted to quickly respond to others, suggesting that he may not have given full effort (e.g., not reading through a complete reading passage, quickly stating an answer to math computation problems without figuring them out). █████ was focused and on task with an appropriate activity level. Overall, █████ appeared to put in good effort and was attentive to tasks. As a result, it is this examiner's opinion that the current evaluation may be an accurate reflection of his current functioning.

Vocational Interview

█████ reported that his favorite subject is history. His least favorite subject is art because he "is not very artistic." He reported that he can work either by himself or in a group but prefers to work in a group so he can add his ideas to those of others and "get a bigger idea." He participates on the basketball team. In his free time, he enjoys playing video games and reading. █████ was interested in becoming a lawyer and reported that he will have to study a lot in order to do so. █████ reported that he does best with arguing. He finds listening to be difficult. At school, he helps out with a variety of household chores, including sweeping and mopping.

Cognitive Assessments Results

Reasoning Abilities:

Fluid Reasoning Very Low

Language Abilities:

Verbal Comprehension Very Low

Visuospatial Abilities:

Visual Puzzles Low Average

Memory:

Digit Span Low Average

Executive Functions: (Attention, Information Processing, Planning and Organization)

Coding Extremely Low

Academic Assessment Results

Reading:

█████ reading ability is measured in two different ways.

Letter and Word Identification: This subtest measures the accuracy of single word reading or █████ overall word identification skills. The student is asked to read aloud from a list of words that increase in difficulty.

Reading Comprehension: This subtest measures literal and inferential reading comprehension skills using a variety of passage and question types that resemble those used in a school setting. The student is asked to read each passage aloud or silently, read each comprehension question by him/herself, and orally answer each question with the passage available for reference.

Mathematics:

█████ math ability and achievement are assessed in two subtests.

Math Concepts and Applications: This subtest measures math problem-solving skills under untimed conditions. The student is asked to listen as the examiner reads each problem, look at the corresponding visual stimuli, and then provide oral and/or pointing responses. Depending upon the grade and ability level of the student, the student solves math problems related to basic skills (counting, patterns, identifying shapes, etc.), everyday applications (time, money, word problems, etc.), geometry, and algebra.

Math Computation: This subtest measures written mathematics calculation skills under untimed conditions. Basic

operations are also tested using fractions, decimals, exponents and algebraic equations.

Written Language:

██████████ written language ability is assessed through two subtests.

Spelling - This subtest measures written spelling of single words from dictation. The student is asked to listen to a target word, listen to the word within the context of a sentence, and then write the word.

Written Expression - This subtest includes items that require the student to write a single sentence from a given prompt, combine multiple sentences into one, and choose a word to complete a blank within a given sentence. The student is also asked to edit passages for correct punctuation and capitalization. Throughout, the student is assessed on his/her ability to correctly fulfill the given prompt, write a structurally sound sentence, apply appropriate grammar skills, and apply correct mechanics to his/her work.

Oral Language:

Oral language skills were within the appropriate range for testing.

Social/Emotional Assessment Results

Social-emotional scores were elevated in areas related to attention and externalizing difficulties.

Summary of Strengths and Challenges

Cognitive Abilities

Strengths and Challenges

██████████ was administered 7 subtests from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fifth Edition (WISC-V). The WISC-V is an individually administered, comprehensive clinical instrument for assessing the intelligence of children ages 6:0-16:11. The primary and secondary subtests are on a scaled score metric with a mean of 10 and a standard deviation (SD) of 3. These subtest scores range from 1 to 19, with scores between 8 and 12 typically considered average. The primary subtest scores contribute to the primary index scores, which represent intellectual functioning in five cognitive areas: Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI), Visual Spatial Index (VSI), Fluid Reasoning Index (FRI), Working Memory Index (WMI), and the Processing Speed Index (PSI). This assessment also produces a Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) composite score that represents general intellectual ability. The primary index scores and the FSIQ are on a standard score metric with a mean of 100 and an SD of 15. The primary index scores range from 45 to 155; the FSIQ ranges from 40 to 160. For both the primary index scores and the FSIQ, scores ranging from 90 to 109 are typically considered average.

A percentile rank (PR) is provided for each reported composite and subtest score to show █████ standing relative to other same-age children in the WISC-V normative sample. If the percentile rank for her Verbal Comprehension Index score is 23, for example, it means that he performed as well as or better than approximately 23% of children his age. This appears in the report as PR = 23.

The scores obtained on the WISC-V reflect █████ true abilities combined with some degree of measurement error. His true score is more accurately represented by a confidence interval (CI), which is a range of scores within which his true score is likely to fall. Composite scores are reported with 95% confidence intervals to ensure greater accuracy when interpreting test scores. For each composite score reported for █████ there is a 95% certainty that his true score falls within the listed range.

It is possible for intellectual abilities to change over the course of childhood. Additionally, a child's scores on the WISC-V can be influenced by motivation, attention, interests, and opportunities for learning. All scores may be slightly higher or lower if █████ were tested again on a different day. It is therefore important to view these test scores as a snapshot of █████ current level of intellectual functioning. When these scores are used as part of a comprehensive evaluation, they contribute to an understanding of his current strengths and any needs that can be addressed.

FSIQ

The FSIQ is derived from seven subtests and summarizes ability across a diverse set of cognitive functions. This score is typically considered the most representative indicator of general intellectual functioning. Subtests are drawn from five areas of cognitive ability: verbal comprehension, visual spatial, fluid reasoning, working memory, and processing speed. █████ FSIQ score is in the Very Low range when compared to other children his age. Although the WISC-V

measures various aspects of ability, a child's scores on this test can also be influenced by many factors that are not captured in this report. It is important to note that Visual Puzzles was substituted for Block Design when deriving [REDACTED] FSIQ score. Subtest substitution introduces the risk of increased measurement error for this score and changes the content of the FSIQ. While the FSIQ provides a broad representation of cognitive ability, describing [REDACTED] domain-specific performance allows for a more thorough understanding of his functioning in distinct areas. Some children perform at approximately the same level in all of these areas, but many others display areas of cognitive strengths and weaknesses.

Verbal Comprehension

The Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) measured [REDACTED] ability to access and apply acquired word knowledge. Specifically, this score reflects his ability to verbalize meaningful concepts, think about verbal information, and express himself using words. Overall, [REDACTED] performance on the VCI was lower than most children his age. Low scores in this area may occur for a number of reasons including poorly developed word knowledge, difficulty retrieving acquired information, problems with verbal expression, or general difficulties with reasoning and problem solving.

With regard to individual subtests within the VCI, Similarities (SI) required [REDACTED] to describe a similarity between two words that represent a common object or concept and Vocabulary (VC) required him to name depicted objects and/or define words that were read aloud. He performed comparably across both subtests, suggesting that his abstract reasoning skills and word knowledge are similarly developed at this time.

Fluid Reasoning

The Fluid Reasoning Index (FRI) measured [REDACTED] ability to detect the underlying conceptual relationship among visual objects and use reasoning to identify and apply rules. Identification and application of conceptual relationships in the FRI requires inductive and quantitative reasoning, broad visual intelligence, simultaneous processing, and abstract thinking. [REDACTED] performance on the FRI was diverse, but overall was very weak for his age (FRI = Very Low range). Low FRI scores may occur for a number of reasons including poor reasoning ability and difficulties with identifying important visual stimuli, linking visual information to abstract concepts, and understanding conceptual or quantitative concepts. [REDACTED] relatively weak performance on the FRI suggests that he may currently experience some difficulty solving complex problems that require him to identify and apply rules.

The FRI is derived from two subtests: Matrix Reasoning (MR) and Figure Weights (FW). Matrix Reasoning required [REDACTED] to view an incomplete matrix or series and select the response option that completed the matrix or series. On Figure Weights, he viewed a scale with a missing weight(s) and identified the response option that would keep the scale balanced. [REDACTED] demonstrated diverse performance on these two tasks. While he showed low-average performance when identifying the missing piece in patterns on Matrix Reasoning, he showed greater difficulty balancing scales under a time constraint during Figure Weights. This pattern of scores implies a relative strength in inductive reasoning compared to quantitative reasoning. It is possible that his understanding of part-whole relationships may currently be better developed than his mathematical reasoning skills. When [REDACTED] solves novel problems, he may have difficulty applying quantitative concepts.

Additional Subtests Contributing to the FSIQ

In addition to the index scores described in this report, the FSIQ includes subtests that measure other areas of cognitive ability. When compared to other children his age, [REDACTED] exhibited very weak to slightly low performance across other subtests contributing to the FSIQ. On Visual Puzzles (VP), he viewed a completed puzzle and appeared to have some difficulty choosing three pieces that would go together to make the puzzle. Visual Puzzles measures non-motor construction ability, which requires visual and spatial reasoning, mental rotation, visual working memory, understanding part-whole relationships, and the ability to analyze and synthesize abstract visual stimuli. His score on this Visual Spatial subtest was within the low average range.

During Digit Span (DS), [REDACTED] listened to sequences of numbers and then recalled the numbers in forward, backward, or ascending order. Digit Span measures mental manipulation, cognitive flexibility, and mental alertness. On this Working Memory task, his performance was slightly below other children his age (DS = low average). On Coding (CD), a Processing Speed subtest, [REDACTED] worked very slowly when copying symbols that were paired with numbers (CD = Extremely Low). Coding measures short-term visual memory, psychomotor speed, visual perception,

visual-motor coordination, visual scanning ability, cognitive flexibility, and procedural and incidental learning ability. This subtest also reflects his attention, concentration, and motivation.

Academics Skills

Strengths and Challenges

overall performance on achievement measures was within the below average range. He demonstrated a relative strength in reading. Spelling ability was below average while significant weaknesses were noted in math and written expression.

Interpretation of Reading Score

In the area of reading, [REDACTED] performed just within the below average range. His ability to read sight words fell just within the below average range. He was able to read the words demerit, quarantine, alibi and archaeologist. Darius's reading comprehension or his ability to understand what he has read was also just within the below average range. He was noted to have more difficulty with inferential type questions.

Interpretation of Math Score

[REDACTED] performed within the lower extreme range in math. When given straight computation problems, [REDACTED] performed within the lower extreme range. He was able to complete single-digit and multi-digit addition and subtraction, without regrouping. He struggled with multi-digit additional and subtraction when regrouping was involved as well as simple multiplication and division. Darius was not able to complete items involving fractions. His performance was within the lower extreme range when these skills were applied to various situations and word problems that were read to him. [REDACTED] was able to answer simple single-step word problems. He was not able to count money, understand fractions or estimate.

Interpretation of Writing Score

In the area of writing [REDACTED] performed within the lower extreme range. His spelling fell within the below average range. On a measure testing his ability to construct sentences/paragraphs, punctuate items, and fill in the blanks, [REDACTED] performed within the lower extreme range. [REDACTED] was able to write sentences with good structure and grammar. His ideas were inconsistently related to the task presented to him. His written work was most impacted by poor mechanics (e.g., punctuation and capitalization). Darius also had difficulty editing given passages for mechanical errors. [REDACTED] was able to write a short article with a good introduction sentence. While he wrote a complete paragraph, his ideas were vague and did not contain any details from the story just created.

Social and Emotional Functioning

Strengths and Challenges

[REDACTED] teacher, Mr. Blactette, was administered the BASC-3 to assess areas that may be currently impacting his academic performance. Validity scales on this report fell within the adequate range, indicating that the scores obtained are an accurate reflection of [REDACTED] strengths and weaknesses. According to his teacher, most scales fell within the average range. [REDACTED] is described as capable of listening to staff members and completing his work. Most concerns fell within the externalizing composite, including hyperactivity, aggression and conduct difficulties. Darius sometimes argues when denied his own way, teases others, threatens to hit others or loses his temper easily (Aggression - At Risk range). He sometimes may disobey, break rules or use things without permission (Conduct Problems - At-Risk range). Darius was reported to often struggle to wait his turn and almost always seeks attention when working. He sometimes disrupts others, struggles to stay in his seat or acts without thinking (Hyperactivity - At Risk range).

Additionally, concerns with attention and anxiety were noted. [REDACTED] often listens to directions but can be easily distracted. He often has a short attention span. He is only organized sometimes and can miss deadlines or make careless mistakes. [REDACTED] is often easily stressed and worries about things that cannot change. He sometimes is fearful or appears nervous.

While average, [REDACTED] scores on study skills, leadership and social skills fell just within the average range. [REDACTED] is able to make decisions easily but is only sometimes able to work under pressure and demonstrate a motivation to succeed. He is almost always polite and often accepts people who are different from himself; however, he only sometimes shows interest in others' ideas or makes them feel welcome. [REDACTED] often turns in work on time and tries

to do well. He struggles to stay on task, think about a strategy before starting to solve a problem and demonstrate organization.

Test Scores

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Fifth Edition

Composite/Subtest	Descriptive Category
Verbal Comprehension	Very Low
<i>Similarities</i>	Very Low
<i>Vocabulary</i>	Low Average
Visual-Spatial	
<i>Visual Puzzles</i>	Low Average
Fluid Reasoning	Very Low
<i>Matrix Reasoning</i>	Low Average
<i>Figure Weights</i>	Very Low
Working Memory	
<i>Digit Span</i>	Low Average
Processing Speed	
<i>Coding</i>	Extremely Low
Full Scale IQ	Very Low

Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Edition (KTEA-III)

	Classification
Reading Composite	Below Average
<i>Letter & Word Recognition</i>	Below Average
<i>Reading Comprehension</i>	Below Average
Math Composite	Lower Extreme
<i>Math Concepts & Applications</i>	Lower Extreme
<i>Math Computation</i>	Lower Extreme
Written Language Composite	Lower Extreme
<i>Written Expression</i>	Lower Extreme
<i>Spelling</i>	Below Average
Academic Skills Battery Composite	Below Average

Behavior Assessment System for Children, Third Edition (BASC-3) (Teacher)

Scale	T-Score	Percentile	Descriptive Category
--------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------

Hyperactivity	68	93	At-Risk
Aggression	61	86	At-Risk
Conduct Problems	60	85	At-Risk
Anxiety	60	86	At-Risk
Depression	48	60	Average
Somatization	49	68	Average
Attention Problems	60	84	At-Risk
Atypicality	53	77	Average
Withdrawal	55	80	Average
Adaptability	44	26	Average
Social Skills	42	25	Average
Leadership	40	19	Average
Study Skills	41	22	Average
Functional Communication	51	46	Average

Composite Scores

Externalizing Problems	64	89	At-Risk
Internalizing Problems	53	75	Average
School Problems	58	81	Average
Behavioral Symptoms Index	59	84	Average
Adaptive Skills	43	25	Average

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

████████ is a 16-year-old boy. The WISC-V was used to assess ██████ performance across five areas of cognitive ability. When interpreting his scores, it is important to view the results as a snapshot of his current intellectual functioning. As measured by the WISC-V, his overall FSIQ score fell in the Very Low range when compared to other children his age. ██████ performance was relatively consistent across all of the Primary index Scores, suggesting that these abilities are developing evenly. Academically, ██████ scores fell just within the below average range for reading, demonstrating a relative strength in this area. Spelling skills were below average while significant weaknesses were noted in written expression and math. Social-emotional scores were elevated in areas related to attention and externalizing difficulties.

Recommendations

Recommendations will be made in collaboration with the Committee on Special Education.

This is to affirm that I personally conducted the enclosed assessment in its entirety and prepared the accompanying written report and solely responsible for its contents.

Evaluator's Name:	Emma Duran	Telephone #:	NYS License#:
Discipline:		Provider Type:	Independent, 21KCCP:FEIGI TAUB HALBERSTAM AUDIO
Language:			
Date of Report:	01/12/2024		

Billing Form for Agency/Independent Evaluator

Vendor Invoice #: _____ Month: _____ Year: _____

Section 1: Student information		Section 2: Provider Information	
Student's Name:	[REDACTED]	Provider's Name:	Emma Duran
DOE ID#:	222729022	Address:	1651 CONEY ISLAND AVENUE
Date of Birth:	02/27/2007	Telephone #:	BROOKLYN, NY 11230

Section 3: Agency Information	
Agency Name:	21KCCP:FEIGI TAUB HALBERSTAM AUDIO
Address:	1651 CONEY ISLAND AVENUE
Telephone #:	BROOKLYN, NY 11230
Federal Tax ID #:	113224714

Rate: \$ _____

Total Amount Due: _____

Section 4: Provider Certification for provision of Services		
<p>I hereby certify that I conducted the assessment in the document included in my report. I understand that when completed and filed, this form becomes a record of the Board of Education and that any material misrepresentation may subject me to criminal, civil and/or administrative action.</p>		
Signature of Provider	Date	
Print Name	Provider License #	Provider Certificate #

Parent/Principal/Guardian Certification	
<p>By my signature I acknowledge that I have reviewed this agency/independent evaluator billing form and that, to the best of my knowledge, these assessments were provided as indicated.</p>	
Signature of Parent/Principal/Guardian	Date